

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. **2:22-cv-06989-MCS-PD**

Date **January 5, 2024**

Title ***Hargis v. Pacifica Senior Living Management, LLC, et al.***

Present: The Honorable **Mark C. Scarsi**, United States District Judge

**Stephen Montes Kerr**

**Not Reported**

**Deputy Clerk**

**Court Reporter**

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

**None Present**

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

**None Present**

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DEFERRING ENTRY OF JUDGMENT AND ORDERING PLAINTIFF TO SUBMIT BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR POST-TRIAL MOTIONS**

On the last day of trial, the Court instructed Plaintiff to submit a proposed judgment and a briefing schedule for post-trial motions within one week. (Minutes, ECF No. 98.) Plaintiff filed a Notice of Lodging attaching the proposed judgment three days later. (Proposed Judgment, ECF No. 99.) Defendant objected, requesting that the Court postpone entering judgment until post-trial motions have been ruled on. (Objection, ECF No. 100.) Neither party has proposed a briefing schedule for post-trial motions.

On the last day of trial, the Court informed the parties it would adjudicate Defendant's defense of estoppel in a post-trial motion to the extent Defendant wished to bring it. Because no post-trial motions have been made, it is unclear whether Defendant intends to continue asserting it. Therefore, the Court defers entry of judgment until post-trial briefing has been completed. *See Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.*, No. 2:17-cv-07639-SJO-KS, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 82972, at \*8 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2020) (noting dearth of "authority stating that a district court may not set a briefing schedule [for post-trial motions] *within* the statutory deadlines"—i.e., before entry of judgment).

The Court orders Plaintiff to submit a jointly proposed post-trial briefing schedule within one week of this Order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**